

direct contact with the liquid phase. The rest of the claims are process claims. Claim 13 is as follows:

"a process for the production of alpha-olefins comprising reacting ethylene under oligomerization conditions in the presence of an effective amount of the catalyst system of claim 1."

What connection at all is there between the above claim and the specifics of the polymerization process described by Hinton? The Applicants assert that there is none because Hinton describes a process for the polymerization of conjugated dienes. The Examiner has failed to show that there is any connection between a process for polymerizing conjugated dienes and a process for the production of alpha olefins (not alpha olefin polymers) which comprises reacting ethylene under oligomerization conditions in the presence of the catalyst of claim 1 of the copending application.

The Applicants assert that the double patenting rejection cannot be sustained because there is no connection between the two references. The Applicants request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Furthermore, the Applicants object to the insertion of this brand new rejection based upon brand new references cited by the Examiner in this application at the time of final rejection. The Applicants should be given a complete opportunity in which to respond to this double patenting rejection before being forced to take the issue to appeal.

Respectfully submitted,

ARIE VAN ZON, ROBERT MOENE,
PHILLIP E. UNGER, PETER ARNOLDY,
and ERIC J. M. DE BOER

By



Attorney, Donald F. Haas
Registration No. 26,177
(713) 241-3356

P.O. Box 2463
Houston, Texas 77252-2463